

OPINION 1286

CHERMES FUSCA ZETTERSTEDT, 1828 (INSECTA,
HOMOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Psylla fusca*, is not to be used in preference to the specific name *fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, as published in the binomen *Chermes fusca*, whenever those names are combined with the generic name *Psylla* Geoffroy, 1762.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, as published in the binomen *Chermes fusca*, with an endorsement that it is to be preferred to the specific name *fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Psylla fusca*, whenever those names are combined with the generic name *Psylla* Geoffroy, 1762 (Name Number 2913);
- (b) *fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Psylla fusca*, with an endorsement that it is not to be used in preference to the specific name *fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, as published in the binomen *Chermes fusca*, whenever those names are combined with the generic name *Psylla* Geoffroy, 1762 (Name Number 2914).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2149

An application for the conservation of *Psylla fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, through the suppression of *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785 was first received from Dr Pavel Lauterer (*Moravske Museum, Brno, Czechoslovakia*) 18 September 1975. In correspondence with Dr Lauterer it was pointed out that *Psylla fusca*, being a nomen dubium, was not suitable for suppression on that ground alone; and that the homonymy involved being secondary, and thus subjectively based, the alternative option of the relative precedence procedure might be considered. Dr Lauterer agreed to this suggestion. His paper was sent to the printer on 23 January 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 159–162. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)11 for or against

the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 160. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — two (2): Ride, Heppell.

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'I am unhappy with the wording of paragraph 6(1) of the application. Even if *fusca* Fourcroy in Geoffroy is not used, as long as it remains an available name *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy remains a senior homonym of *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt). Would it therefore not be better to suppress *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy, 1785 and all its uses before the publication of Zetterstedt's name, for the purposes of both priority and homonymy? The loss of *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy cannot be very serious, and it has a junior objective synonym in *Chermes castanea* Gmelin, 1789.

'Another solution would be (but I cannot judge its taxonomic merits) to designate as neotype of *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy a specimen that does not belong to the genus *Psylla* as now understood. This would remove *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy from *Psylla* and the name then ceases to be a threat to its junior secondary homonym, *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt).'

Ride: '*Psylla fusca* Geoffroy, 1785 is a forgotten name and its use is contrary to the purpose of the Law of Priority (Article 23 a–b). No case is made to preserve it. The Commission should be asked to suppress it under the plenary powers, as appears to have been Lauterer's original intention.' [No evidence has been presented to show that *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy, 1785 is a senior synonym of a name in general current use. R.V.M.]

Heppell: 'To place *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy on the Official List makes a mockery of that list. From the applicant's evidence that taxon is either (a) completely unidentifiable, in which case its name can be suppressed without loss, or (b) not a *Psylla* and probably not even an homopteran, in which case *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt) is not a secondary homonym under the revised homonymy rules adopted at Monaco. I sympathize with the applicant's wish to conserve *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt) but feel that he has been ill advised on the method chosen to achieve this result.' [Unfortunately for this argument, *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt) had been replaced as a junior secondary homonym before 1961 by *Psylla perspicillata* Flor, 1861. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

fusca, *Chermes*, Zetterstedt, 1828, *Fauna Insectorum lapponica*, p. 552

fusca, *Psylla*, Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, *Entomologia parisiensis, sive catalogus insectorum qui in agro parisiensi reperiuntur*, p. 224.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)11 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1286.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

11 July 1984